IT Support Services

Conducting Campus Based IT Consolidation Studies

November 1, 2004

Document 05-105 Revision History

01-NOV-2004	**05-105: Posted for Review**

Texas Department of Information Resources
Austin, TX

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

Senate Bill 1701 of the 78th Legislature directed the Department of Information Resources (DIR) to develop a comprehensive information technology consolidation plan. In partial fulfillment of this requirement, DIR developed these guidelines to assist agencies and universities develop onsite information technology (IT) support models for the multi-agency office buildings they occupy.

ISSUE

As part of the Statewide IT Asset Reporting (SITAR) process in early 2004, Texas agencies reported investments of about $85 million and 837 FTEs annually on IT support services. Nearly 90 percent of the State's annual IT budget is spent on an agency-by-agency basis instead of a consolidated statewide approach. A significant percentage of each agency's IT budget is spent to maintain basic operations through the purchase of commodity products and services.

The Texas Building and Procurement Commission has made a concerted effort to group agencies with similar responsibilities together in a single facility. Small separate agency field offices have also been moved to larger buildings or campuses. As a result of these moves, IT facilities for two or more agencies have also been co-located. Currently agencies manage these operational functions autonomously. Economies of scale may be achieved through consolidation of certain local support issues.

The methodology described in this guideline can be used to capture information about current systems and processes, analyze alternatives for consolidation of services, and develop an action plan to implement the most viable processes. The steps are:

Step 1: Organizing a Study Team and a Steering Committee.
Step 2: Performing a Preliminary Review.
Step 3: Assessing the Current Environment
Step 4: Evaluating Service Areas.
Step 5: Identifying Consolidation Projects
Step 6: Identifying Options for Funding, Organization and Governance
Step 7: Recommending the Consolidation Plan.
Step 8: Obtaining Management Approval
Step 9: Developing a Project Plan
Step 10: Implementing the Consolidation Plan

BOTTOM LINE

In instances where multiple agencies occupy a single office building, economies of scale may be achieved through consolidation of certain local support issues. DIR believes that significant savings could result from efforts to consolidate some of the support services organizations in these consolidated locations. In addition to cost savings, consolidating and leveraging IT resources through shared services would result in service delivery improvements, as agencies are able to provide greater focus on their core missions.

STEPS IN CONDUCTING A CONSOLIDATION STUDY

This Section describes the process of conducting an IT consolidation study at a multi-agency building or campus. The guidelines should be used to identify and analyze alternatives that could save money and improve efficiency by consolidating IT services at collocated agencies.

The Department of Information Resources and agencies collocated in Austin's William P. Hobby Building used these steps to analyze consolidation opportunities within the facility. The results suggested that the Hobby building agencies should, among other steps, consolidate Internet Connections, collocate equipment in a secure room, consider new sourcing options for selected IT support services.

A more detailed discussion of each of the steps follows.

STEP 1: ORGANIZING A STUDY TEAM AND A STEERING COMMITTEE

STUDY TEAM

A study team should be formed to assess current conditions and identify consolidation opportunities. The team will evaluate the feasibility of consolidating and/or collocating IT services in a campus environment. The team should:

- Consist of representatives from the stakeholder agencies;
- Include individuals with expertise in the agencies' program areas;
- Include staff familiar with the agencies' information technologies;
- Designate one individual to lead; and
- Report to a steering committee.

STEERING COMMITTEE

A steering committee should be appointed to provide general direction to the study team and to ensure that it has adequate resources to complete its tasks. The steering committee will need to meet frequently during the study and implementation phases. Once the new system is in place, it may meet less often. The steering committee should:

- Consist of senior managers from each of the stakeholder agencies;
- Provide policy guidance to the study team;
- Meet throughout the study period;
- Continue while consolidation projects are in progress;
- Remain after the consolidated system has been implemented;
- Approve annual budgets; and
- Resolve any major issues that may arise in the operation of the consolidated system.

STEP 2: PERFORMING A PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The study team should consider IT areas for potential consolidation to decide which ones would be most feasible to pursue. This determination should be based on a high-level assessment for each possibility. A review of this type should not consume a lot of staff time or other resources. The following should be considered in the assessment:

- Perform a high-level review of agency IT support service expenditures;
- Determine the availability of resources needed to conduct the study;
- Use a predetermined threshold to determine if an area is feasible to consolidate. The threshold should take into account:
  - total number of staff that support the IT service under review
  - annual expenditures associated with providing the services to each separate agency
  - significant management, operational and/or security issues that exist within current systems.
- Decide if return on investment is significant enough to perform a more detailed analysis;
- Eliminate from consideration projects that offer little payback or resolve no significant issues; and
- Document all decisions.

STEP 3: ASSESSING THE CURRENT ENVIRONMENT

The potential opportunities for consolidation identified as viable through a high-level review should be further analyzed. To start the analysis:

- Capture detailed requirements and configuration information based on current operations at each of the agencies located in the building or at the campus being studied; and
- Obtain cost and performance data from each agency.

Acquiring the services of an outside specialist to assist in the documentation and assessment process may be beneficial for agencies in some cases. Such services may be available from DIR, other state agencies, or private companies.

FUNCTIONAL SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

To gather functional system requirements for the current systems:

- Document functional system requirements for each participating agency separately;
- Use a spreadsheet or other data collection format;
- Obtain the requirements from:
  - requests for Proposals (RFPs);

- user reference manuals or similar documents;
- knowledgeable agency staff.

ACCESS AND PHYSICAL SECURITY

- Obtain measures currently taken by an agency to physically secure equipment and to limit access to certain system functions (based on user id, passwords, key disks or other methods)

HARDWARE

To perform an inventory of hardware assets:

- Document hardware configurations for each current agency system through diagrams or schematics;
- Identify all network connections and equipment such as:
  - routers
  - hubs
  - firewalls
  - servers
  - networked printers
- Identify all connections to Wide Area Networks through network devices; and
- Document the physical location of each network component and server that are connected to the agencies' networks.

PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Current service level requirements for application response times, time to print typical documents, and response times for trouble calls should be maintained or exceeded by the replacement system. To determine the performance level for the consolidated systems:

- Document current performance levels for each system that may be replaced by a consolidated system.
- Document gaps between current performance levels and desired performance levels in the new consolidated system.

OPERATIONAL COSTS

The operational costs associated with the current systems also need to be documented in order to perform an analysis of alternatives for a replacement system. Cost savings, including reductions in the amount of staff time needed to support current operations, is one of the primary justifications for many decisions to consolidate IT resources. Accurate cost estimates regarding the current and proposed systems are essential to making good decisions about consolidation opportunities. Sources for cost information are:

- DIR's SITAR report, which contains data provided by all agencies in early 2004
- Biennial Operating Plan
- IT-related data included in the agencies' most recent Legislative Appropriation Request (LAR)

STEP 4: EVALUATING SERVICE AREAS

Once a preliminary review of service areas and an assessment of the current environment are completed, the study team should undertake a more detailed evaluation of specific IT service areas. The following steps should be taken:

- Review the following service areas for consolidation opportunities:
  - E-mail/Messaging Systems
  - Local Area and Wide Area Networks
  - Help Desk and Desktop Computing Services
  - Firewall maintenance
  - Internet access
  - Internet Web site hosting
  - Server Hardware (application, database, DNS, proxy, etc.)
- Estimate the current costs for each functional area under consideration for consolidation;
- Document any significant differences in the approaches currently used by the individual agencies;[1]
- Compare and contrast the previously created network diagrams; and
- Note areas of commonality as well as differences among the agency configurations.[2]

DESKTOP HARDWARE

Information about PCs, monitors, printers, and other peripherals will be needed to assess the possibility of consolidating help desk and/or desktop computing services. Hardware and software configuration differences and hardware replacement schedules are important factors in a decision to consolidate help desk and desktop computing services.

- Collect and compare information about desktop hardware.
- Look at the standard software suite installed on each agency's PCs.

FIREWALLS

Each agency will typically have its own firewalls and use different firewall hardware and software. Some agencies use demilitarized zones. Data can be placed outside the agency's firewall for retrieval through the public Internet, yet agency software programs can still update the information securely.

- Document the current firewall configurations, both hardware and software, at each co-located agency;
- Document any unique security requirements used by the agencies.

[1] For example, the use of different e-mail software by co-located agencies would be a significant factor in any decision to consolidate e-mail.

[2] For example, if each agency provides it's own firewall protection but uses different equipment and software, the assessment document should clearly identify the equipment and software used by each individual agency. Similar comparisons should be made for other common components such as Web servers, DNS servers, e-mail servers, etc.

INTERNET ACCESS

Depending on the size of the agency and the options available at their location, a variety of Internet Service Providers (ISP) may be utilized and the monthly access cost may vary substantially.

- Identify and document the Internet Service Providers (ISP) used by each agency;
- Identify the type of Internet services provided;
- Identify the associated costs;
- Include any Internet Web Hosting Services that are provided by an ISP; and
- Document details of equipment used and staff support levels for agencies that utilize internal staff and resources for creating and maintaining a Web site.

SERVERS

Server configurations may have been identified previously in the hardware configurations of e-mail, networks, or web services. For those that have not, the following steps should be taken:

- Document servers at each co-located agency used for running:
  - applications
  - databases
  - other types of software
- Document DNS servers and proxy servers if not already included in another area.

CUSTOM SOFTWARE

Because software development cycles and application functionality are typically very different, it is unusual to find ready-made opportunities for consolidation of custom software across agencies. However, such opportunities should not be ignored if they exist because similar agencies might be able to use a single custom software application.

- Review custom developed software applications;
- Look at agencies with similar licensing and regulatory authority over different professions that have similar rules and procedures.

STEP 5: IDENTIFYING CONSOLIDATION PROJECTS

The study team should review the assessment of the current situation once it has been completed and documented. The team should look for opportunities to consolidate services that would benefit all of the agencies involved.

The team should further document any opportunities that would:

- Save significant amounts of money
- Reduce staffing requirements
- Move to statewide IT standards

Once the opportunities for consolidation are identified, the following steps should be taken:

- Develop a list of requirements for the consolidated system;
- Include all previously identified requirements, selecting the most stringent requirement where multiple similar requirements are found;
- Organize the requirements by such functional areas as:
  - Help Desk services
  - E-mail services
  - LAN/WAN management
  - Web services
  - Database services
  - Application services

DOCUMENTING ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

Alternative technical approaches should be identified to address each opportunity. The advantages and disadvantages of each approach need to be documented in order to support the recommendations of the technical team and to allow decision makers to chose the best single approach. For each alternative, the team must document:

- Hardware and software configurations;
- Implementation steps;
- Estimated costs;
- Technical, organizational, and budget related issues;
- Feasibility of consolidating various functions at different times rather that all at once;
- Determine if a Return on Investment (ROI) analysis will need to be prepared. (If significant start-up costs are involved);
- Decide whether some services can be consolidated or co-located immediately, while others may need to wait until funding becomes available;
- Determine which agencies may not be in a position to be included in a consolidated service until a future time if, for example, the agency has a current contract for services that cannot be canceled without a substantial penalty; and
- Determine if a phased approach to the consolidation of services is warranted to allow agencies to begin using the new services once they have met their obligations under current contracts.

ENHANCEMENTS

Participating agencies may also wish to document any significant enhancements they would like to implement as a part of a combined system. Enhancements may be included in a consolidation project if all co-located agencies agree that they are desirable and if funding is available. Otherwise, enhancements should be undertaken in a separate project that will be scheduled to begin after the initial consolidation efforts are completed.

STEP 6: IDENTIFYING OPTIONS FOR FUNDING, ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

The steering committee will need to address cost sharing and governance issues related to any new, shared systems that are to be developed. Startup costs and ongoing operating costs will need to be identified. Although operational costs for a consolidated system can probably be accommodated within agency operating budgets, “seed” money may be necessary to pay the startup costs.

FUNDING OPTIONS

Startup costs may include system development costs and initial outlays for software, equipment, and training. In many cases, the estimated startup costs will exceed the collective ability of the cooperating agencies to cover the costs from their existing budgets. Depending on whether or not startup costs are an issue, one of the following cost-sharing models could likely apply:

STARTUP COSTS INCLUDED IN EXISTING BUDGETS

EACH INDIVIDUAL AGENCY PAYS FOR SELECTED PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

Each separate agency would agree to pay directly for specific products and services. The funds would be directly applied to the startup costs for the project. The agencies would have a cost sharing agreement among them, but would not transfer funds.

Advantages

There would be no need to set up an interagency voucher payment process.
Agencies could move ahead quickly with the plan.

Disadvantages

No disadvantages have been identified at this time.

ONE OR MORE AGENCIES PAY THE STARTUP COSTS AND THE OTHER AGENCIES REIMBURSE THEM –

A subset of agencies involved in the consolidation project would pay for the products and services needed for the startup effort. Each of the remaining agencies would reimburse the purchasing agencies an agreed-upon amount. The payments would be made through an interagency voucher process.

Advantages

Agencies could move ahead with plan quickly.

Disadvantages

Interagency agreements, including a voucher process would have to be executed.

STARTUP COSTS EXCEED EXISTING BUDGETS

AGENCIES PROCURE SERVICES WITH NO UP-FRONT COST

A private sector service provider would develop and install the system without an initial payment. They would recover development costs over time from fees paid by the agencies for ongoing services.

This arrangement may be useful if the vendor is willing to recover an initial investment over a multi-year period. Typically, agencies pay monthly or annual fees that would include an amortized amount aimed at recovering:

- System start up costs plus interest
  - Ongoing operating costs incurred by the vendor
  - A prorated portion of the profit margin expected by the vendor

Advantages

Agencies can avoid a large, up-front expenditure to pay for development costs.

Disadvantages

Total costs could be higher if the service provider charges a high rate of interest on the initial development costs.

RIDERS IN THE APPROPRIATIONS BILL RELATED TO SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED BY ONE STATE AGENCY TO OTHERS

Riders in the biennial appropriations bill may be useful in some instances. Riders specify legislative intent. A rider could require agencies to use services provided by another agency or through a statewide contract with third-party service providers. In this situation, an agency or contractor would have greater confidence that costs would be recovered for setting up and operating a service bureau for others.

Advantages

Riders may also be used to provide authority for a co-located agency to provide services to other agencies in the absence of specific legislation that authorizes such support on a cost reimbursement or other basis.

Disadvantages

The main disadvantages of this approach are 1) the appropriation process occurs only once in a biennium and 2) a significant amount of coordination among the affected agencies, the LBB and the legislature must occur in order to ensure success.

CONTRACTS FOR SERVICES BETWEEN A PRIVATE SERVICE PROVIDER AND A GROUP OF AGENCIES THAT HAVE SIMILAR SERVICE NEEDS

The agencies jointly issue a Request for Offer in order to contract for services from a vendor. The results of this approach could be:

- A single contract that includes all the co-located agencies as principal parties
- Individual, coordinated contracts between the vendor and each of the co-located agencies

Agencies can and should take advantage of “blanket” contracts for seat management and other services that have already been negotiated by DIR or other State agencies.

Advantages

Agencies can reduce their costs by acting together to contract for similar services.

Disadvantages

The contracting process will be more complicated if multiple agencies are involved in the negotiations.

INTERAGENCY CONTRACTS FOR SERVICES

Another approach that may be taken by the co-located agencies is to contract for consolidated services with another state agency such as DIR.

Advantages

Agencies can reduce costs by negotiating a single contract with the agency that provides services.

Disadvantages

The contractor may not be able to react quickly to fast-changing priorities.

LINE-ITEM APPROPRIATIONS FOR SEED/STARTUP MONEY TO BUILD NEEDED INFRASTRUCTURE

One or more of the co-located agencies will use the Legislative Appropriation request (LAR) process to obtain startup funding and/or operating funds.

Advantages

Agencies would be able to fund technology projects that would otherwise not be possible.

Disadvantages

Since LARs are considered by the Legislature only once every two years, this approach may not be feasible due to project timing considerations.

LEGISLATION WHICH MANDATES CAMPUS CONSOLIDATION THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION RESOURCES, COUNCIL ON COMPETITIVE GOVERNMENT OR OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Current legislation requires larger agencies that purchase or contract certain IT services to use the West Texas Disaster Recovery and Operations Center or obtain a waiver. While there is no current legislation that requires agencies to use DIR or other organizations for campus consolidation projects, there have been recent recommendations by the State Auditor's Office (SAO) and the Comptroller of Public Accounts (CPA) that could change the situation in the future.

Advantages

Agencies are given clear directions to take action.

Disadvantages

Appropriations for implementing legislative mandates may not cover all costs.

OPERATIONAL ORGANIZATION

The organization and supervision of the operational staff must be considered when evaluating consolidation alternatives. The co-located agencies should carefully consider the organizational structure to ensure that:

- The staffing level is appropriate
- Staff can effectively perform its responsibilities
- Agencies can maintain an acceptable level of service.

Several scenarios related to the organizational structure of the operational staff are discussed below. In some cases, it may be appropriate to begin with one organizational structure and migrate over time to a different one, based on staff attrition, funding mechanisms or other factors.

AN EXISTING TENANT PROVIDES SUPPORT FOR OTHER AGENCIES IN AN OFFICE BUILDING OR CAMPUS COMPLEX–

Appropriate Conditions

This scenario is appropriate if one of the co-located agencies has trained IT staff and facilities that are significantly larger than the others.

Description

Certain staff positions could be dedicated to providing services to the other agencies and the agencies would be allowed to establish the priorities for the identified employees.

Under these conditions:

- the agencies will need to enter into an agreement, which will allow the agency providing services to adjust the staffing on a day-to-day basis according to needs.

- staff assigned to support the co-located agencies might be utilized on other tasks when there was no pending priority tasks for the agencies.
- The providing agency could also add resources when the workload was temporarily too large for the dedicated support staff to meet agreed-upon service levels.
- The expectation is that the heavy and light workloads will average out over a relatively short time.

SUPPORT SERVICES ARE OUTSOURCED TO A PRIVATE COMPANY –

Appropriate Conditions

This scenario should likely be used in instances where a vendor is contracted to provide IT support services to co-located agencies.

Description

In this instance, the agencies could be billed on a per-hour basis for services rendered or on a monthly or other periodic schedule based on fixed fees or fees that vary based on the number of users served.

Under these conditions:

- Internet access fees may be based on a certain cost for each user-id that is active for a given billing period.
- The contract will need to specify when operational and service personnel will be on site at the campus and the service levels expected for adding new users, correcting problems, etc.

SERVICES ARE OUTSOURCED TO DIR OR ANOTHER AGENCY THAT PROVIDES SUPPORT SERVICES -

Appropriate Conditions

This scenario is essentially the same as Scenario 2 with the exception that the service provider is another State agency and will be paid through an interagency contract arrangement.

Description

The billing structure and agreements related to service levels and on site staff availability should be negotiated and specified in the interagency contract.

Under these conditions:

- Periodic reviews of the contract should be conducted to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of all involved agencies.

CO-LOCATED AGENCIES PROVIDE FOR THEIR OWN SERVICES WITH EQUIPMENT, STAFF AND/OR FACILITIES SHARED WITH OTHER AGENCIES –

Appropriate Conditions

Under this scenario, the co-located agencies will hire and maintain their own dedicated staff to handle IT services.

Description

Each agency will potentially provide services in one or more service areas to the other agencies. This type of arrangement can be complicated to manage, but it may be an expedient way to consolidate co-located agencies that have existing staffs and who wish to proceed with minimum disruption

Under these conditions:

- An interagency agreement can be used to specify the services and/or expertise to be provided by each participating agency.
- Agencies can reduce the need for training every staff member in all areas of IT support.
- One agency could employ and train a specialist for e-mail and Web services, a second agency could be responsible for network management and a third could provide help desk and desktop computing services.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

An established governance structure will be necessary during the time periods when:

- Alternatives for sharing services are being considered
- The project to establish a shared infrastructure and service is underway
- The consolidated operational system is in place.

The governance structure that should be composed of:

- An executive steering committee that:
  - meets at least quarterly to agree on high-level project priorities
  - reviews status of projects and operations
  - approves policy changes that affect all user agencies
  - coordinates plans for future enhancements
- A project manager and team that spends a large portion of their time on the project until implementation of the new system is complete;
- An operations committee that meets at least monthly to coordinate operational issues and priorities; and
- A staff-level workgroup that can handle day-to-day operational coordination on an as-needed basis

STEP 7: RECOMMENDING THE CONSOLIDATION PLAN

The recommended approach to consolidating services must be documented. If no opportunities for consolidation are identified, the study team should indicate no further action should be taken at this time.

If consolidation opportunities have been found, the recommendations will:

- Identify the services to be consolidated
- Describe how they should be consolidated
- Indicate how the consolidated system should be funded
- Specify any organizational and/or governance changes that should be made.

A time-frame for implementing the recommended changes should be established.

Several members of the study team along with project implementation experts should be formed into an implementation team. It should consist of staff members who:

- Are skilled in project management;
- Have detailed knowledge of the technologies involved in the proposed changes; and
- Are familiar with the current operations of each of the co-located agencies that will use the new capabilities.

In some cases, participating agencies may not have staff with all the necessary skills or may not be able to devote the necessary amount of staff time to implement the recommended solutions. When this occurs, the agencies should consider contracting with another agency or with a contractor to obtain the needed expertise.

A detailed cost/benefit analysis should be conducted as a part of the recommended approach for implementing changes. The analysis should include:

- Estimated start up costs
- Ongoing operational costs associated with the proposed solution
- Information on the return on investment (ROI) associated with the new system

DIR has worked with a number of other agencies and commercial organizations to develop a methodology for estimating the ROI for a new system. The methodology is documented separately and is available for use by the study team.

STEP 8: OBTAINING MANAGEMENT APPROVAL

Management approval must be obtained before moving forward with the recommended solution. The steps involved in obtaining agreement to proceed with implementation of a consolidation effort will likely be agency dependent. Members of the steering committee should work within their individual agencies to secure the needed approvals. Once approval to move forward with the proposed solution has been secured, an implementation project manager needs to be assigned and a detailed project plan should be developed.

STEP 9: DEVELOPING A PROJECT PLAN

A plan for implementing the project must also be developed. A draft project plan can be useful in the approval process. It can provide decision makers with estimated completion dates and identify areas of impact on agency staff during the implementation timeframe. If the steering committee believes that it will be useful, a tentative project plan should be developed before obtaining project approval.

If the agencies have the resources to implement the proposed solution and the steering committee has the authority to move forward with implementation, the project may advance quickly.

However, if outside funding needs to be secured and/or higher-level agency approval is needed, the process will be more involved and could take a significant amount of time.

STEP 10: IMPLEMENTING THE CONSOLIDATION PLAN

Project implementation is typically the most resource intensive and risky step in a consolidation project. The steering committee or study team should:

- Meet with the project manager often to ensure that the implementation is proceeding according to plan and within budget.
- Ensure that the project is on schedule and will meet the agencies' needs.
- Address any funding or policy issues that may arise.
- Receive status reports from the implementation team in an acceptable format.
- Establish an acceptable reporting frequency.
- Keep informed of the progress, risks, and issues.

REFERENCES

[1] Texas Department of Information Resources, *A Foundation For Change – Leveraging a Statewide Technology Infrastructure* (Austin, Texas, May 2004).

[2] Texas Department of Information Resources, *William P. Hobby Building IT Consolidation Case Study* (Austin, Texas, October 2004).

[3] Texas State Auditor's Office, *Addressing Operating Risk and Improving the Efficiency of Texas State Government* (Austin, Texas, February 2003).

[4] Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts*, Special Report to the Legislature – Additional e-Texas Recommendations* (Austin, Texas, April 2003).

APPENDIX A – PURPOSE OF THE GUIDE

INTRODUCTION

More than 100 Texas state agencies have facilities located at various sites across the State. Although many State agencies exist in the Austin area, a significant number of field offices are situated in other Texas cities and rural locations. To improve the efficiency of state owned and leased facilities the Texas Building and Procurement Commission (TBPC) recommends the collocation of agencies with similar responsibilities and consolidation of multiple small field offices into a single larger facility. This has resulted in a number of instances where information technology (IT) facilities for two or more agencies are co-located in the same building or campus.

SCOPE

This document offers guidance to state agency and university personnel involved in campus-based IT consolidation studies. It provides a framework, which can be used to develop appropriate onsite IT support models for multi-agency office buildings and campuses in Austin and around the State.

METHODOLOGY

About 90 percent of the State's annual IT expenditures are made on an agency-by-agency basis and a significant percentage of these expenditures are for products and services that can be classified as commodity IT services. Commodity services include telecommunications equipment, database and application servers and desktop PCs, as well as, off-the-shelf computer programs for handing e-mail, Internet Web access and security applications. Some of the services that fall into the commodity category include Local and Wide Area Network management, messaging and collaboration services and Help Desk support.

In early 2004, DIR published the State IT Asset Report (SITAR), which included information on IT expenditures and staffing levels related to various categories of IT spending in Texas state government. The SITAR indicated that Texas agencies spend about $85 million and invest 837 FTEs annually on IT support services. DIR believes that significant savings could result from efforts to consolidate some of the many support services organizations that exist in Texas agencies. This document provides a methodology that can be used to capture information about current systems and processes at co-located agencies, analyze alternatives for consolidation of services and develop an action plan to implement the most viable alternative.

APPENDIX B – STATE FACILITIES THAT HOUSE MULTIPLE AGENCIES

BUILDING	AGENCY
AIRCRAFT POOLING BOARD, AUSTIN	
10335 GOLF COURSE RD	AIRCRAFT POOLING BOARD
	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
	THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM
	PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT
BROWN HEATLY BUILDING, AUSTIN	
4900 NORTH LAMAR	TEXAS REHABILITATION COMMISSION
	HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION
	EARLY CHILDHOOD INTERVENTION
	TEXAS JUVENILE PROBATION COMMISSION
	TEXAS YOUTH COMMISSION
TX COM. FOR THE BLIND ADMIN. BLDG., AUSTIN	
4800 NORTH LAMAR	TEXAS COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND
	TEXAS COMM. FOR THE DEAF & HARD OF HEARING
CENTRAL SERVICES BUILDING, AUSTIN	
1711 SAN JACINTO	TX BUILDING & PROCUREMENT COMMISSION
	COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
	DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION RESOURCES
EL PASO STATE OFFICE BUILDING, EL PASO	
401 E. FRANKLIN	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
	COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
	GENERAL LAND OFFICE
	SECRETARY OF STATE
	DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
	TX DEPT OF HOUSING & COMM AFFAIRS
	STATE OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
	TEXAS LOTTERY COMMISSION
	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
	TEXAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMM
	RAILROAD COMMISSION

BUILDING	AGENCY
	TEXAS ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE COMMISSION
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
	PROTECTIVE AND REGULATORY SERVICES
	TEXAS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
	TEXAS FOREST SERVICE
	RIO GRANDE COMPACT COMMISSION
	TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD
	TEXAS COMM. ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
	PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT
ELIAS RAMIREZ STATE OFFICE BUILDING, HOUSTON	
5425 POLK AVENUE	DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
	TEXAS REHABILITATION COMMISSION
	TEXAS DEPT. OF LICENSING & REGULATION
	TEXAS DEPT OF INSURANCE
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
	PROTECTIVE AND REGULATORY SERVICES
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
	TEXAS COMM. ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FRANK JOSEPH COSMETOLOGY BUILDING, AUSTIN	
5717 BALCONES DRIVE	BOARD OF BARBER EXAMINERS
	TEXAS COSMETOLOGY COMMISSION
FORT WORTH STATE OFFICE BUILDING, FORT WORTH	
1501 CIRCLE DRIVE	DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
	TEXAS REHABILITATION COMMISSION
	TX DEPT OF HOUSING & COMM AFFAIRS
	TX COMMISSION OF FIRE PROTECTION
	TEXAS DEPT. OF LICENSING & REGULATION
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
	PROTECTIVE AND REGULATORY SERVICES
G. J. SUTTON BUILDING, SAN ANTONIO	
321 CENTER ST	TEXAS WORKFORCE COMMISSION
	DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
	TX DEPT OF HOUSING & COMM AFFAIRS
	TX COMMISSION OF FIRE PROTECTION

BUILDING	AGENCY
	DEPARTMENT OF BANKING
	TEXAS DEPT. OF LICENSING & REGULATION
	TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD
	TEXAS YOUTH COMMISSION
	TEXAS DEPT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INSURANCE BUILDING, AUSTIN 1100 SAN JACINTO	COURT OF APPEALS - SECOND COURT
	OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
	TEXAS OFFICE OF STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS
	COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE (ADMIN BY 301)
INSURANCE ANNEX BUILDING, AUSTIN 221 E. 11TH ST.	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
	TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
JOHN H. WINTERS BUILDING, AUSTIN 701 WEST 51ST STREET	DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
	TEXAS DEPT. OF AGING
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
	PROTECTIVE AND REGULATORY SERVICES
	MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION
OLD SENATE PRINT SHOP, AUSTIN 311 EAST 14TH ST.	TEXAS RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION COMMISSION
	TEXAS SAVINGS AND LOAN DEPARTMENT
	DEPARTMENT OF BANKING
PRICE DANIEL, SR. BUILDING, AUSTIN 209 WEST 14TH ST.	COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
	STATE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
	THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS
	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
	TEXAS DEPT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
ROBERT E. JOHNSON STATE OFFICE BLDG, AUSTIN 1501 NORTH CONGRESS	TEXAS SENATE
	LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
	LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
	LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY

BUILDING	AGENCY
	SUNSET ADVISORY COMMISSION
	STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE
SUPREME COURT BUILDING, AUSTIN	
201 W. 14TH ST.	SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS
	COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
	COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
	OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION
	STATE LAW LIBRARY
	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
STEPHEN F. AUSTIN BUILDING, AUSTIN	
1700 NORTH CONGRESS	COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
	GENERAL LAND OFFICE
	TEXAS WORKFORCE COMMISSION
	OFFICE OF RURAL COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
	TEXAS DEPT. OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
	OFFICE OF THE STATE DEMOGRAPHER
	TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD
	TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
SAM HOUSTON BUILDING, AUSTIN	
201 EAST 14TH ST.	TEXAS SENATE
	LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
	TEXAS ETHICS COMMISSION
	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
	TEXAS COMM. ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
	PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT
	STATE PRESERVATION BOARD
TOM C. CLARK BUILDING, AUSTIN	
205 WEST 14TH ST.	SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS
	BOARD OF LAW EXAMINERS
	COURT REPORTERS CERTIFICATION BOARD
	COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
	OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION
	STATE LAW LIBRARY
	TEXAS DEPT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
ERNEST O. THOMPSON BUILDING,	

BUILDING	AGENCY
AUSTIN	
920 COLORADO	FIREMEN'S PENSION COMMISSION
	TEXAS VETERANS COMMISSION
	TEXAS DEPT. OF LICENSING & REGULATION
	TEXAS COMMISSION ON THE ARTS
THOMAS JEFFERSON RUSK BUILDING, AUSTIN	
200 E. 10TH ST.	COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
	SECRETARY OF STATE
	STATE SECURITIES BOARD
	TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVESITY
	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS
	THE TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
CARLOS F. TRUAN NATURAL RESOURCES CENTER, CORPUS CHRISTI	
6300 OCEAN DRIVE	GENERAL LAND OFFICE
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
	TEXAS FOREST SERVICE
	TEXAS COMM. ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
	TEXAS A & M - CORPUS CHRISTI
	PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT
WACO STATE OFFICE BUILDING, WACO	
801 AUSTIN AVE.	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
	COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
	TEXAS COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND
	DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
	TX DEPT OF HOUSING & COMM AFFAIRS
	STATE OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
	TEXAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMM
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
	HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION
	PROTECTIVE AND REGULATORY SERVICES
	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
WILLIAM B. TRAVIS BUILDING, AUSTIN	
1701 NORTH CONGRESS	RAILROAD COMMISSION
	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF TEXAS
	OFFICE OF PUBLIC UTILITY COUNSEL
	TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

BUILDING	AGENCY
	STATE BOARD OF EDUCATOR CERT.
WILLIAM P. CLEMENTS BUILDING, AUSTIN	
300 WEST 15th St.	STATE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT
	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
	DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION RESOURCES
	STATE PENSION REVIEW BOARD
	TEXAS PUBLIC FINANCE AUTHORITY
	TEXAS BOND REVIEW BOARD
	STATE OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
	COMMISSION ON JAIL STANDARDS
	STATE OFFICE OF RISK MANAGEMENT
	STEPHEN F AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY
	FOOD AND FIBERS COMMISSION
WILLIAM P. HOBBY BUILDING (3 TOWERS), AUSTIN	
333 GUADALUPE ST.	TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE
	TX BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL GEOSCIENTIST
	BOARD OF TAX PROFESSIONAL EXAMINERS
	HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL
	TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS
	COMMISION ON STATE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS
	STATE BOARD OF PODIATRIC MEDICAL EXAMINERS
	TEXAS FUNERAL SERVICE COMMISSION
	TEXAS OPTOMETRY BOARD
	BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF PSYCHOLOGISTS
	PHYSICAL THERAPY & OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY
	OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSURANCE COUNSEL
	TEXAS STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANCY
	TEXAS STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
	TEXAS STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS
	STATE BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
	BOARD OF NURSE EXAMINERS
	BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS
	TEXAS STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY
	VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS